CONNECTICUT

LAW

JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 29

January 16, 2018

175 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Rodriguez (Order), 327 C 992	100 60
granted summary judgment in favor of defendant health care provider; whether cause of action for breach of duty of confidentiality arising out of physician-patient relationship is recognized by common law; whether existence of subpoena precluded liability; recognition of common-law causes of action, discussed.	
Cohen v. Cohen, 327 C 485	5
Dissolution of marriage; motion to modify alimony based on substantial increase in defendant's income; whether prior modification order was sufficient to fulfill underlying purpose of original alimony award; claim that trial court improperly considered parties' financial circumstances at time of divorce decree when it granted motion to modify prior modification order; claim that court was barred from considering purpose of original alimony award when crafting modification; whether plaintiff's motion for modification was legally insufficient on its face on ground that it alleged only that defendant's income had significantly increased; whether court properly considered extrinsic evidence of parties' intent when they entered into separation agreement; claim that court improperly took judicial notice of plaintiff's previous financial affidavit in court file; claim that trial court's modification order was impermissible; claim that allowing supported spouse to share supporting spouse's standard of living after divorce was not legitimate purpose of original alimony award; whether court was required, under Dan v. Dan (315 Conn. 1), to presume that exclusive purpose of alimony award in present case was to allow plaintiff to maintain standard of living that she had enjoyed during marriage.	
Emerick v. Glastonbury (Order), 327 C 994	102
Epps v. Commissioner of Correction, 327 C 482	2
Friedman v. Dooven (Order), 327 C 993	101
Gostyla v. Chambers (Order), 327 C 993	101 26
Termination of parental rights; claim that trial court improperly terminated respondents' parental rights as to their minor child pursuant to statute (§ 17a-112 [j] [3] [C]) because there was no evidence that acts of parental commission or omission had caused child to suffer harm prior to her removal from respondents' home; whether termination of parental rights improperly was based on finding of predictive harm; whether trial court improperly found that criteria of § 17a-112 (j) (3) (C) had been proven on basis of respondents' postremoval acts of parental omission, including their continuing failure to acknowledge cause of injuries to their other child; whether there was sufficient evidence presented to establish that respondents' omissions were harmful to child; claim that expert testimony was insufficient to establish that child had been psychologically harmed.	20
Constituted on word)

(continued on next page)

Puff v. Puff (Orders), 327 C 994. Redding Life Care, LLC v. Redding (Order), 327 C 991. State v. Danovan T. (Order), 327 C 992. State v. Torres (Order), 327 C 995. Stephen J. R. v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 995. 21st Century North America Ins. Co. v. Perez (Order), 327 C 995. Williams v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 996. Wilson v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 993. Volume 327 Cumulative Table of Cases.	99 100 103 103 103 104 101 105
CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS	
Pettiford v. State, 179 CA 246	28A
should have rendered judgment on merits rather than dismissed action. State v. Lebrick, 179 CA 221 Felony murder; home invasion; conspiracy to commit home invasion; burglary in first degree; attempt to commit robbery in first degree; assault in first degree; claim that former testimony of witness was inadmissible hearsay because it did not fall within exception to hearsay rule set forth in § 8-6 (1) of Connecticut Code of Evidence; claim that state failed to establish that witness was unavailable; whether state demonstrated that it made good faith effort to locate witness; claim that admission of witness' former testimony violated defendant's rights under confrontation clause of sixth amendment to United States constitution; claim that trial court improperly admitted testimony of firearm and tool mark expert in violation of § 4-1 of Connecticut Code of Evidence because state failed to establish relevancy of his testimony by providing sufficient evidentiary foundation that photographs, report, and notes relied on by expert were associated with crimes at issue in present case; claim that defendant's right to confrontation was implicated by admission of expert's opinion testimony where expert's opinion was formulated in part on basis of his review of ballistic report prepared by former employee of state's forensic laboratory who was not available to testify at trial.	3A
State v. Montana, 179 CA 261	43A
Volume 179 Cumulative Table of Cases	53A

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes \S 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications Office of Production and Distribution 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453 Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178 www.jud.ct.gov

Richard J. Hemenway, $Publications\ Director$

 $Published\ Weekly-Available\ at\ \underline{\text{http://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal}}$

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by Eric M. Levine, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions* Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES	
Port Authority, Connecticut	1E 1E
MISCELLANEOUS	
Office of the Chief Public Defender	20